

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 24 and 30 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 24, 26, 27 and 30 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 24 and 30 are the independent claims. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claims 1, 3, 24 and 30 stand objected for a minor informality.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 24 and 30 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection of claims 1, 3, 24 and 30 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Konuma et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030443).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 24, it is noted that claim 24 recites a low molecular weight full color organic electroluminescent device comprising: a first electrode formed on a substrate; a first organic film layer formed on the first electrode; an emitting layer formed on the first organic film layer; a second organic film layer formed on the emitting layer; and a second electrode formed on the second organic film layer, wherein the first organic film layer comprises a hole blocking layer formed of a compound represented by one of the following Formulas 24 or 26.

Konuma discloses a device having a pixel electrode, a thin film of an EL material and an opposite electrode (paragraph [0016]). Konumo also discloses that the device further comprises an electron transporting layer and a hole blocking layer formed of BCP (paragraph [0061]).

Accordingly, although Konumo discloses a hole blocking layer, Konumo fails to teach or suggest that the hole blocking layer is formed of a compound represented by one of Formulas 24 or 26, as recited in independent claim 24.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because Konumo fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 24.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-11, 26 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon et al. (EP 0 851 714) in view of Konuma et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030443).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a donor film of a low molecular weight full color organic electroluminescent display device, the donor film comprising, amongst other novel features, a substrate film; a photothermal conversion layer; and a transfer layer, wherein the transfer layer comprises a hole blocking layer formed of a compound represented by one of the following Formulas 24 or 26.

The Office Action relies on Kwon for a teaching of some of the features of independent claim 1, and recognizes that Kwon does not teach or suggest forming a hole blocking layer as part of the functional layers of the transfer layer to form the EL device. Therefore, the Office Action relies on Konuma for such teachings, and states that Konuma discloses a hole blocking layer formed of BCP.

However, although Konumo discloses a hole blocking layer, Konumo fails to teach or suggest that the hole blocking layer is formed of a compound represented by one of Formulas 24 or 26, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kwon nor Konumo, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 30, it is noted that this claim recites some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of this claim is also traversed for substantially the same reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 26 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because they include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9-11 and 26 also distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kwon et al. (EP 0 851 714) in view of Konuma et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030443) in further view of Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0008224).

Regarding the rejection of claim 27, it is noted that claim 27 depends from independent claim 1. As noted above, neither Kwon nor Konuma, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest the novel features of independent claim 1.

Fujita, on the other hand, is relied upon solely for a teaching of a gas generating layer, but fails to teach or suggest any of the novel features of independent claim 1. Accordingly, Fujita fails to cure the deficiencies of Kwon and Konuma.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Kwon, Konuma, nor Fujita, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1 from which claim 27 depends.

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Akai (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0045021) in view of Konuma et al (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030443).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites a donor film of a low molecular weight full color organic electroluminescent display device, the donor film comprising, amongst other novel features, a substrate film; a photothermal conversion layer; and a transfer layer, wherein the transfer layer comprises a hole blocking layer formed of a compound represented by one of the following Formulas 24 or 26.

The Office Action relies on Akai for a teaching of some of the features of independent claim 1, and recognizes that Akai does not teach or suggest forming a hole blocking layer as one of the multiple layers of the EL device. Therefore, the Office Action relies on Konuma for such teachings, and states that Konuma discloses a hole blocking layer, and in particular that the hole blocking layer is formed of BCP.

However, Applicants note that although Konumo discloses a hole blocking layer, Konumo fails to teach or suggest that the hole blocking layer is formed of a compound

represented by one of Formulas 24 or 26, as recited in independent claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and/or §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Akai nor Konumo, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 24 and 30, it is noted that these claims recite some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of these claims is also traversed for substantially the same reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-11 and 26 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claim 1, and because they include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-11 and 26 also distinguish over the prior art.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 11/13/09

By: Douglas X. Rodriguez
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., NW
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510